Center for Scientific Review 2004. Review of Bioengineering Grant Applications

Jean D. Sipe, Ph.D.
Scientific Review Administrator MOSS G Study Section
(Musculoskeletal Tissue Engineering and Repair)
Review Policy Web Coordinator
Center for Scientific Review, NIH

PHS 398 Instructions (May 2001 revision)

a. Specific Aims: List broad, long term objectives, i.e. what research is intended to accomplish:

to test a stated hypothesis, create a novel design,solve a specific problem or develop new technology.

Review of Bioengineering Applications in CSR

- Bioengineering Sciences & Technologies IRG (BST), Sally Amero, Chief
- Surgical Sciences, Biomedical Imaging & Bioengineering IRG (SBIB), Eileen Bradley, Chief
- Musculoskeletal, Oral & Skin Sciences IRG (MOSS), Daniel McDonald, Chief
- Cardiovascular Sciences IRG (CVS), Joy Gibson, Chief
- Other, organ specific, IRGs

BRP Review, October 2004 Council Cycle

- 67 applications received January 21, 2004
  - 21-SBIB
  - 10-BST
  - 9-MOSS
  - 9-CVS / HEME
  - 18- Eight other IRGs
- Review is by special emphasis panel (SEP)
- Priority Scores are not ranked by percentile

BRG & EBRG (R21) Review

- BRG and EBRG applications are reviewed by standing study sections and by special emphasis panels.

- BRG priority scores are ranked by percentile relative to the standing study section or the CSR total base.

- EBRG priority scores are ranked according to specific institute practice.

Review of BRG & EBRG (R21) applications, October 2004 Council Cycle

- 88 BRG applications: Jun 1, Jul 1, 2004
  - 22 BST
  - 20 SBIB
  - 17 MOSS
  - 29 other, organ specific, IRGs
- 195 EBRG applications: Jun 1, Jul 1, 2004
  - 40 BST
  - 49 SBIB
  - 22 MOSS
  - 94 other, organ specific, IRGs

Preparing a Competing Renewal BRP or BRG Grant Application

- Reviewers will apply the same standards, if not higher, than for original application.
- Don’t assume reviewers have seen original application (include PA on BRG renewals).
- Progress report – outstanding productivity, new directions, open up field.
- Re-emphasize innovation, impact on field, not same old, same old.
- Read instructions (FONT FONT); Clear Format.
- Obtain critical, substantive pre-review.

There is no grantsmanship that will turn a bad idea into a good one, but……..

There are many ways to disguise a good one.

William Raub, Past Deputy Director, NIH